

Serial No. 10/648,384

Docket No. RPL-0006REI

Reply to Office Action of February 26, 2008

Amendments to the Drawings

A Replacement Sheet has been submitted to overcome the drawing objection.

REMARKS

Claims 21-46, 60-72, and 77-80 are pending. In this paper, the non-elected claims have been canceled and a Replacement Sheet has been submitted to overcome the drawing objection.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings for failing to show the “cells” recited in the claims. A Replacement Sheet for Figure 7 has been submitted to show these features and to correct a typographical error relating to reference numeral 101b. Applicants submit that no new matter has been by this amendment.

For example, as originally filed the specification discloses that a cell corresponds to a location where a column electrode (e.g., X1) is crossed with two row electrodes (e.g., Y1 and Y2). See column 5, lines 49-51, of the patent specification and Figure 7. The structure of a cell is also evident from Figure 9 which is consistent with the aforementioned disclosure at column 5, i.e., one cell comprises electrodes X1, Y1, and Y2 and voltages are applied to these electrodes to control wall charges to induce emission of light from the cell. The application of voltages to the electrodes of the cell is further apparent from Figure 8.

In order to clarify these features, the Replacement Sheet for Figure 7 has been amended to include two dotted boxes (210 and 220) which are adjacent to one another in a column direction. As shown by these boxes, the adjacent cells share a same row electrode, e.g., Y2, which supports the subject matter recited in claim 21. Corresponding portions of the specification have been amended to reference the dotted boxes in Figure 7.

Because all of this subject matter was supported by the specification as originally filed, it is respectfully submitted that the amendments to Figure 7 and the specification introduce no new matter. Withdrawal of the drawing objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 21-46, 60-72, and 77-80 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, on grounds that the meaning of a cell is unclear. Applicants submit that the meaning of “cell” or “cells” as used in the claims is clearly apparent to one skilled in the art in view of the original specification and drawings, and the clarifying amendments and remarks provided above to overcome the drawing objection. Withdrawal of the § 112 rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and timely allowance of the application is respectfully requested.


To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Serial No. 10/648,384
Reply to Office Action of February 26, 2008

Docket No. RPL-0006REI

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Samuel W. Ntiros
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DYK/SWN/kzw
Date: May 27, 2008

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610